

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated December 1, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12, 14, 16, 18-20, 25 and 27 are pending. Claims 4, 8-11, 13, 17, 21-24, 26 and 28-32 have been canceled herein, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 5-7, 12, 14, 18-20, 25 and 27 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, e.g., at page 24, line 1 - page 26, line 27 of the specification, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are in independent form.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,510,411 (*Norton et al.*). Without conceding the propriety of that rejection, the independent claims have been amended herein. Applicants submit that, for at least the following reasons, the amended independent claims are patentable over *Norton et al.*

By virtue of the claimed invention, a system is provided for enabling a user to select or input information into one of a plurality of input forms displayed on a display, by using speech, which is then recognized by the system. Thus, a user can employ, e.g., a voice browser, without having to employ another input device such as a pointing device or a keyboard.

According to the claimed invention, it is determined whether a speech recognition result includes an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the

content data or an absolute position expression defined in terms of a display range displayed on the display screen. Then, based on the determination result, input form information is selected corresponding to the speech recognition result. The input form information includes layout information indicating a position of an input form. Finally, a display pattern of an input form corresponding to the selected input form information is controlled to distinguish the selected form from other displayed forms.

Thus, according to the claimed invention, a user can designate (utter), e.g., “third from top of overall contents” or “third from top in display range,” and the system can determine if the speech recognition result includes an absolute position in terms of the overall contents or an absolute position in terms of the display range, and, based on the speech recognition result, the system can select the input form designated by the user.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, determination means for determining whether the speech recognition result (generated by speech recognition means recognizing input speech) includes an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the content data or an absolute position expression defined in terms of a display range on the display screen; first selection means for selecting input form information based on the absolute position expression if the speech recognition result includes an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the content data; second selection means for obtaining layout information of the display range currently displayed on the display screen and selecting input form information based on the absolute position expression and the obtained layout information if the speech recognition result includes an absolute position expression defined in terms of the display range on the display screen; and second display

control means for controlling a display pattern of an input form corresponding to the input form information selected by said first or second selection means to distinguish the selected input form from other displayed input forms. Each of independent Claims 14 and 27 recites identical or similar features.

Applicants submit that, for at least the following reasons, nothing in *Norton et al.* would teach or suggest at least the above-noted features of the Applicants' claimed invention.

Norton et al. relates to a task oriented dialog model manager, including a task-oriented dialog model (task model), a development tool and a Dialog Manager. The task model is a framework for describing the application-specific information needed to perform the task. The development tool is an object that interprets a user specified task model and outputs information for a spoken dialog system to perform according to the specified task model. The Dialog Manager is a runtime system that uses output from the development tool in carrying out interactive dialogs to perform the task specified according to the task model.

Regarding col. 5, lines 16-51 of *Norton et al.*, Applicants understand that this portion of *Norton et al.* teaches merely speech recognition and prompting for information. Regarding Fig. 5 of *Norton et al.*, Applicants understand that this portion of *Norton et al.* teaches merely a screen shot of a user interface having plural controls (tabs, buttons, etc.).

It is noted that, in the Office Action, the Examiner cited Fig. 5 of *Norton et al.* as teaching the subject matter of dependent Claims 10 and 11 (as they stood prior to the

instant Amendment). Applicants submit that Fig. 5 of *Norton et al.* fails to teach or suggest, among other aspects of Applicants' claimed invention, anything pertaining to an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the content data or an absolute position expression defined in terms of a display range on the display screen. In that regard, it is noted that Fig. 5 of *Norton et al.* is discussed at col. 28, lines 51-67 of that document.

This discussion in its entirety reads as follows:

Fig. 5 is another exemplary screenshot for the first embodiment of a user interface for the development tool in accordance with the present invention. A sample filler builder window 500 is shown. Window 500 has a tool bar 501 for file management, editing features and tools, window management, help and the like. In a tabbed format, string subwindow 502, number subwindow 503, currency subwindow 504, date subwindow 505, time subwindow 506 and keypad subwindow 507 can all be brought to the forefront of the window 500 for data entry. String subwindow 502 is shown in Fig. 5. Variables can be listed in portion 508. New variables, can [sic] be entered in portion 509, with a value to be added 510. Values are listed in portion 51 [sic]. An option 512 is provided to make fillers unique. Additional options are also provided such as a test button 513, help button 514, further easing use of the developments tool in specifying information.

As will be understood from reading the contents of the above discussion, nothing therein, or in Fig. 5 itself, is seen to pertain to an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the content data or an absolute position expression defined in terms of a display range on the display screen. For at least this reason, nothing in *Norton et al.* is understood to teach or suggest determining whether a speech recognition result includes an absolute position expression defined in terms of all of the content data or an absolute position expression defined in terms of a display range on the display screen, selecting input form information corresponding to the speech recognition result, or controlling a display pattern of an input form corresponding to the selected input form

information.

Applicants note that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” M.P.E.P. 2131. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” M.P.E.P. 2131. In regard to the elements of Claims 10 and 11 (as presented in the last Amendment) involving an “absolute position expression,” Applicants submit that the Office Action did not identify those elements in *Norton et al.* in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Office Action did not satisfy the requirements necessary to establish a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), at least with respect to Claims 10 and 11. Should the Examiner again cite *Norton et al.* with reference to elements of the pending claims involving an “absolute position expression,” the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify in requisite detail the specific elements in *Norton et al.* that are deemed to correspond to Applicants’ claimed elements.

In conclusion, since *Norton et al.* is understood not to contain all of the elements of independent Claim 1, that claim is believed allowable over that document. Since each of independent Claims 14 and 27 recite features similar or identical to those of Claim 1, those claims are also believed allowable over that document.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants’ opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Pinsky', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Douglas W. Pinsky
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DWP/kim

DC_MAIN 232151v1